DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 828 HE 011 195

TITLE Planning for Postsecondary Education in California: A Five-Year Plan Update, 1979.
INSTITUTION California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Dec 78
NOTE 38p.
AVAILABLE FROM California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Accreditation (Institutions); Adult Education; Affirmative Action; Basic Skills; Career Planning; Collective Bargaining; Educational Assessment; Educational Counseling; Educational Finance; *Educational Planning; Enrollment Trends; Equal Education; Facilities; Government Role; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Information Systems; *Master Plans; Nontraditional Students; *Postsecondary Education; Private Colleges; Program Evaluation; Regional Planning; *Statewide Planning; Student Costs; Student Financial Aid; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *California; Lifelong Learning

ABSTRACT

This 1979 update to the five-year plan for postsecondary education in California evaluates the progress made in reaching goals and resolving major issues and also considers new issues. An overview of California Postsecondary Education Commission, segmental, and legislative activities is provided for each of the major issues. The following topics are considered: equal educational opportunity for ethnic minorities, women, low income students, and students with disabilities; faculty and administrative affirmative action; financing postsecondary education; student financial aid; tuition, fees, and access; adult education/lifelong learning; educational and career counseling; basic skills deficiencies; vocational education; organization and governance of vocational education; regulation of private postsecondary institutions; evaluation of the effectiveness of postsecondary education; accreditation; state-level postsecondary education information system; collective bargaining; regional planning; stabilized, declining, and shifting enrollments; program planning; and facilities planning. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169828

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Calif PSE
Comm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

PLANNING FOR POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA: A FIVE-YEAR PLAN UPDATE

1979

HE 011 905

Prepared by the
California Postsecondary Education Commission
Adopted December 1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Introduction		1
I.	Equal Educational Opportunity: Access and Retention	3
II.	Faculty and Administrative Affirmative Action	6
III.	Financing Postsecondary Education	7
IV.	Student Financial Aid	10
V.	Tuition, Fees, and Access	11
VI.	Adult Education/Lifelong Learning	12
VII.	Educational and Career Counseling	14
VIII.	Basic Skills Deficiencies	16
IX.	Vocational Education	17
X.	Organization and Governance of Vocational Education	19
XI.	Regulation of Private Postsecondary Institutions	20
XII.	Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Postsecondary Education	21
XIII.	Accreditation	23
XIV.	State-Level Postsecondary Education Information System	24
XV.	Collective Bargaining	26
XVI.	Regional Planning	27
XVII.	Stabilized, Declining, and Shifting Enrollments	28
XVIII.	Program Planning	29
XIX.	Facilities Planning	31
Cross-Reference Table		34

INTRODUCTION

The California Postsecondary Education Commission was created by the Legislature in 1973 to plan for and coordinate postsecondary education. A major Commission responsibility, and one mandated in the enabling legislation (Education Code, Chapter 11), is to develop, in consultation with the various segments of postsecondary education, successive five-year plans for all of California postsecondary education and update these plans annually.

In the early stages of developing its first Five-Year Plan, the Commission decided to take the initiative in the planning process by setting statewide goals, identifying issues, and establishing priorities among the more important issues. In essence, this established the Five-Year Plan as an issue-oriented document. Rather than simply integrating the segmental plans into a common format, the Commission asked the segments to indicate what they were doing or planning to do to resolve the major issues facing California postsecondary education.

This issue-oriented approach to planning has been effective, in that it has enabled the Commission to accommodate the different missions of the segments and to relate its planning to broad State goals for postsecondary education. Emphasis upon broad consultation with representatives of varied constituencies--the Governor's Office, the Legislature, faculty, students, administrators, and the public at large--aided significantly in clarifying the issues and in developing specific recommendations for both Commission and segmental activities.

In its current form, the Five-Year Plan establishes the planning base, framework, goals, and major issues for a five-year period, while the annual updates evaluate the progress made in reaching the goals and resolving the major issues. The updates may also deal with new issues as they arise and make recommendations for further State action on the basis of Commission progress reports, evaluations, and studies. This 1979 Update, like the two preceding it, provides an overview of Commission, segmental, and legislative activities with regard to each of the major issues. As the Commission is now ready to begin the planning process again, in anticipation of a new Five-Year Plan to be published in 1980, it is important to assess the progress that has been made in resolving the various issues, and to determine which of them will still be with us as we face new problems in the 1980s.

Recent trends in postsecondary education--such as the coming decline in the number of 18-24 year olds, the changing participation rates, and the rising proportion of ethnic minorities in California's

population--indicate that the problems of the eighties will be somewhat different from those faced by postsecondary education in the seventies. In addition, the effects of "Proposition 13," which severely limits the use of property taxes as the funding base for public education, have yet to be fully evaluated. It is obvious, however, that changes in the nature of funding of our public institutions will be one of the major issues facing the State in 1979-80. It is these trends and new issues, combined with those difficult issues from the seventies which have yet to be resolved, that will form the basis of the new Five-Year Plan.

This 1979 Update, then, serves both to signal the end of one planning cycle and the beginning of a new. In looking back at the progress made in resolving the major issues identified here, we are also preparing ourselves to look forward to new issues, new goals, and new achievements for California postsecondary education in the 1980s.

EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY: ACCESS AND RETENTION

ETHNIC MINORITIES, WOMEN, LOW-INCOME STUDENTS

Ethnic minorities, women, and low-income students are underrepresented* in most of California's public colleges and universities. The Legislature, through Assembly Concurrent Resolution 151 (Vasconcellos, 1974), requested the public segments to prepare plans to respond to this problem, with the plans to be submitted to the Commission on or before July 1, 1975. The Commission was requested to report annually to the Legislature on the progress made in implementing these plans and in improving educational opportunities for ethnic minorities, women, and low-income students.

The Commission has published three reports in response to ACR 151's request (in April 1976, June 1977, and May 1978). These reports have each provided the same general conclusions:

1. Each of the public segments has responded differently to the legislative request to develop and implement a plan to address and overcome the underrepresentation of ethnic minority, women, and low-income students in their undergraduate and graduate student bodies. Thus far, however, none of the segments has fully complied with ACR 151 (in terms of developing the plans).

2. One of the goals of ACR 151 was for the public segments to expand their enrollment of Chicano/Latino and Black students in order to adequately address and overcome, by 1980, ethnic underrepresentation in their student bodies. This goal will not be achieved. In fact, during the past three years, there has been a net decrease in the number of Chicano/Latino and Black students enrolled at public postsecondary institutions. However, the State University and Colleges have made some progress in expanding the enrollment levels of Chicano and Black students within that segment.

---

* The method used to determine the degree of underrepresentation was discussed in Chapter 3 of Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education: Part I. Briefly, the enrollment level of ethnic minorities and women in postsecondary education is compared to their 1973 twelfth-grade enrollment in California public schools. Underrepresentation of an ethnic minority group means that a smaller percent is enrolled in postsecondary education than was enrolled in the twelfth grade in 1973.

3. The University of California has continued to make gradual progress in increasing educational opportunities for women in graduate programs. In Fall 1977, approximately 33 percent of the University's graduate students were women.

The University of California has made the most progress in developing a comprehensive affirmative action plan for undergraduate students, which was submitted to Commission staff in May 1978. The University is now preparing a plan to respond to the needs of ethnic minorities, women, and low-income students in graduate and professional education. As yet, no date has been announced for completion of this plan.

The California State University and Colleges began preparation of a comprehensive systemwide plan with the appointment of a student affirmative action task force in March 1977. A draft of the comprehensive plan for undergraduates was submitted to Commission staff in September 1978. The State University has not yet begun preparation of a plan for its graduate student body.

The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges is working with individual colleges in the development of local plans. The role of the Chancellor's Office has been to assist the colleges by providing guidelines and encouraging the sharing of ideas. A comprehensive plan for student affirmative action in the Community Colleges was scheduled for completion in September 1978, but had not been received at the time this Update was adopted.

Under a grant from the Ford Foundation, the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities is conducting a study of current and proposed student affirmative action programs on independent college campuses. Several categories of programs are being covered including: recruitment; financial aid; and support services such as orientation, counseling, and tutoring.

The current activities of Commission staff pursuant to ACR 151 include: (1) working with campus-based officials to encourage the establishment of regional, intersegmental student affirmative action programs; (2) reviewing the adequacy of support services and financial aid policies and programs at the University of California's professional schools; (3) studying the implications of State and federal student financial aid policies and programs for equal educational opportunity; (4) considering the implications for equal educational opportunity of exception admissions and alternative admissions policies and practices at the four-year public institutions; and (5) analyzing the obstacles for American Indian students which limit their admission to and successful completion of a college education in California. The results of

these activities, and an examination of both campus-based and systemwide affirmative action programs, will be included in the next Commission report in this series, Equal Educational Opportunity in Postsecondary Education: Part III, which will be published in Spring 1979.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

In 1976, the Legislature adopted Assembly Concurrent Resolution 201, which directed the three public segments to "prepare a plan that will provide for addressing and overcoming, by 1980, the underrepresentation of handicapped students in the makeup of the student bodies of institutions of public higher education." The Commission was to integrate these plans and transmit them to the Legislature and the Governor with comments.

In March 1978, the Commission approved a staff report entitled, Equal Educational Opportunities for People With Disabilities: A Preliminary Response. This report, which transmitted the segmental plans to the Legislature and the Governor, discussed several of the problems inhibiting a more complete response to ACR 201. These problems included the lack of an appropriate statewide comparison group, the lack of student data needed to determine the degree of underrepresentation, and the lack of any estimates of the funding needed to implement a statewide affirmative action program for students with disabilities.

Despite this lack of information, the Commission felt that it could still work with the segments to produce a statewide plan to increase the representation of students with disabilities. The final document, entitled, A State Plan for Increasing the Representation of Students with Disabilities in Public Higher Education, was adopted by the Commission in June 1978. The State Plan is intended to provide a framework for the delivery of services to students with disabilities. The Commission anticipates that each segment will expand on the Plan according to its statutory mission and function.

In addition to assisting in the development of the State Plan, the three segments are preparing budget statements assessing current expenses and estimating additional funds required to meet the needs and increase the representation of students with disabilities. These financial statements will be presented to the Legislature during the 1979-80 budget cycle. Currently, only one segment, the California Community Colleges, receives funding specifically for students with disabilities (under AB 77, Chapter 275, Statutes of 1976).

Future activities in this area include the collection of data on students with disabilities and biennial segmental evaluations (beginning in 1980).

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

In 1977, the Legislature adopted AB 105 (Hughes, 1977), which requires the Commission

> to report to the Legislature and the Governor on March 1, 1980, and every two years thereafter until and including 1984, concerning the employment, classification, and compensation of ethnic minorities and women

by the University, the State University, and the Community Colleges, and on the results of affirmative action efforts by those institutions.

To this end, the Commission has collected Fall 1977 base-year data from the federal Higher Education Staff Information Survey, which the institutions file with the Commission on a biennial basis. This base-year data will be compared to Fall 1979 data for purposes of the 1980 report. In addition, the individual segments are to provide narrative evaluations of both the patterns of underutilization and their respective affirmative action employment programs. The Commission will analyze the data and the segmental self-evaluations and will report the results to the Governor and the Legislature in March 1980.

FINANCING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

The Education Code directs the Commission to

> participate in appropriate stages of the executive and legislative budget process . . . and [to] advise the executive and legislative branches as to whether the segmental programmatic budgetary requests are compatible with the state plan.

The Commission and its staff fulfill this obligation through two kinds of activities.

First, the Commission periodically considers staff reports on budget issues and submits these, with recommendations, to the appropriate authorities. Examples of these reports include the Commission's 1977 study of Community College finance, Financial Support for the California Community Colleges: Characteristics, Objectives, and Alternatives, and a survey of finance methods for two-year colleges in other states, Methods of Two-Year College Finance in Selected States: Supplement to Commission Report 77-3.

Second, the Commission staff participates in the annual budget cycle which involves (1) discussions prior to the budget hearings with the staffs of the Legislature, the segments, and other State agencies; (2) formal analyses of certain budget items relevant to the Commission's role in statewide planning and coordination; (3) an "Overview of Postsecondary Education" which the Director delivers to open the Legislature's budget hearings on higher education; (4) oral and written responses to questions from subcommittee members during the budget hearings; and (5) a final statement to the Committee of Conference on the Budget Bill on important items in dispute between the Assembly and the Senate. The staff's primary activity in the budget review process has the goal of bringing the Commission's formal actions and recommendations, expecially those expressed in its Five-Year Plan and subsequent updates, to bear on the actual allocation of resources to postsecondary education.

The unique aspect of the budget cycle this year was the passage of Proposition 13, the tax limitation initiative. The tax limits in Proposition 13 served to decrease the amount of local property taxes available to the California Community Colleges from $880 million down to an estimated $320 million for 1978-79. In addition to the $535 million in regular State apportionments for the Community Colleges in 1978-79, the Legislature adopted a measure which appropriated an additional $260 million from the State's surplus. This amount was designed to enable each Community College district to reach 85 percent of its projected (pre-Proposition 13) 1978-79

budget. This caused a projected decline in total revenues for the colleges from $1,383,300,000 in 1977-78 to $1,225,800,000 in 1978-79.

In March 1978, the Community College Chancellor appointed a Finance Task Force charged with studying the existing system of financing operations and capital outlay, identifying problems and alternatives, and making recommendations. The twenty-two member Task Force consists of members from State agencies, boards of trustees, college administrations, faculties, and student bodies. The Commission staff has one representative on the Task Force, and we have offered to assist with information and ideas.

Naturally, the focus of the study has changed in the wake of Proposition 13. Rather than a wide-ranging study of Community College clienteles and ways in which the finance system might better meet their needs, the focus has narrowed to the specific issues of the colleges' mission, governance, finance, and management. These areas are reflected in the names of four study groups, consisting of Community College personnel, which were established to collect information and debate issues before items are presented to the full Task Force. The Chancellor has also appointed a large "Crganizations Committee" with representatives from every conceivable group interested in Community College finance. This Committee is intended to be a crucible for testing ideas so that a relatively solid front can be forged before legislation is drafted.

After discussions with all these groups, the Chancellor's staff recommended a finance proposal for 1979-80 to the Board of Governors in early December, 1978. The staff expects to complete long-range recommendations early in 1979. The Commission will consider these recommendations and render advice on them to the Governor and Legislature before adoption of the 1979-80 Budget Bill.

FINANCIAL CONDITION OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES

The Legislature, through Assembly Bill 622 (Chapter 462, Statutes of 1975), requested the Commission to conduct a comprehensive study of California's independent colleges and universities. The study was to: (1) assess the financial condition of the independent sector; (2) determine the goals, objectives, and priorities of State aid to independent colleges; (3) recommend possible modifications in existing State programs; and (4) assess the contributions made to postsecondary education and to California by the independent colleges.

In response to this legislative request, the Commission prepared a report entitled, State Policy Toward Independent Postsecondary Institutions (June 1978). Its major conclusions were:

1. While there is some evidence of institutional weakness and potential deterioration, the majority of California's independent colleges and universities seem to be in relatively stable financial health;

2. The State's student-assistance programs, particularly its Scholarship Program, are of vital importance to the financial stability of the independent sector; and

3. A vital, healthy independent sector is a necessity, not a luxury, in California postsecondary education.

Accordingly, State policy decisions about student-assistance programs should continue to reflect an appreciation of the many non-cost-related benefits produced by the independent colleges, and enjoyed by California's citizens.

Past and current State policy toward independent institutions has been successful in achieving the desired State objectives. Therefore, the Commission recommended that the existing policy of providing assistance to qualified students with financial need who desire to enroll in an independent college should be continued, and should be coordinated with changes in federal student-assistance programs. The Commission found that these financial aid programs are desirable and should be maintained in a way that will (1) give students the opportunity to attend the postsecondary institutions which most closely meet their educational needs; (2) give independent institutions a reasonable and fair opportunity to compete with public institutions in the recruitment and education of students; and (3) encourage constructive competition between public and independent institutions to promote high quality and diversified educational opportunities.

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

Despite the long history of student financial aid in California, and the present $71.4 million budget of the Student Aid Commission, many questions exist about the effectiveness of student aid programs. In response to this concern, the 1978-79 Budget Act provides $121,275 for the Commission and the Student Aid Commission to appoint a student financial aid policy group which will report to the Legislature by December 30, 1979. The group will consider four major issues: (1) how best to fulfill the purposes of student financial aid; (2) what are the appropriate levels of funding and methods of distribution for student aid; (3) what are the responsibilities of different funding agencies--federal, State, institutional, and private; and (4) how a federal, State, institutional, private organization, and student "partnership" can best be implemented in California.

In the past, Commission staff has participated in a variety of advisory and study groups on student aid. Legislation analysis, budget review, and the Commission report, State Policy Toward Independent Institutions, have all helped develop background for an assessment of student aid issues.

Current Commission staff activities include analysis of legislation, liaison with the Student Aid Commission, and participation in various Student Aid Commission activities, including the Advisory Group on Financial Aid Problems, the Joint Commission Advisory Committee on Student Aid Research, and an ad hoc Committee on Aggregate Need Analysis.

The segments will appoint representatives to the student aid policy study group. In the 1978-79 Budget, the public segments received some direct State funding for student aid and related programs such as EOP/EOPS, and Student Affirmative Action.

TUITION, FEES, AND ACCESS

The 1977 Update identified the effect of student fees on access to education as an issue of some concern. At that time, however, the prospect of tuition in the public segments seemed unlikely, and the pressure to raise student fees at the University and the State University came from inflationary increases in the cost of nonacademic services which those fees supported. These pressures, in fact, diminished after the State assumed some of the costs.

However, the fiscal crisis in the wake of Proposition 13 has made higher student charges an issue once again. The President of the University of California announced that increased fees or the institution of tuition would be considered for 1978-79 if General Fund support from the State were severely curtailed. In a letter to the Legislature's Conference Committee on the Budget, the Commission's Director supported efforts to prevent any fee increases in 1978-79:

> Increased student charges must be considered as one of several possible sources of additional funding for the long-range financing of postsecondary education. Such charges, however, are certain to cause substantial enrollment shifts and greater demands for student aid. The impact on access and the intersegmental consequences of such changes should be studied carefully prior to adoption of any such increases.

The University's administration has now announced that it will not impose fee increases for 1978-79. The alternative of a fee increase was raised when it appeared that the State University might be called upon to reduce its 1978-79 budget nearly fifteen percent. Subsequently, the Legislature in supplementary language to the Budget indicated that no tuition or fee increase should be charged by the Trustees in 1978-79. The Community College Chancellor's Task Force on Finance is investigating various levels of student charges for that segment.

Commission staff is engaged in two activities related to student fees. First, the staff is developing computer-based, price-response models which should be able to predict the impact of fee increases on the aggregate enrollment of students. Second, the Postsecondary Education Commission and the Student Aid Commission have received $121,375 to conduct a study of the State's policies and goals for student financial aid, as described in the preceding section on Student Financial Aid.

ADULT EDUCATION/LIFELONG LEARNING

Californians are using the postsecondary educational system for formal learning beyond compulsory school age in ways that become ever more diverse. More are attending part-time, over longer periods of their lives, and using more different modes of learning than ever before. The Commission has been asked by a variety of sources, including the Legislature and the Department of Finance, what adaptations must be made in the State's educational system in order to help meet the population's varying educational needs equitably, effectively, and economically. Are part-time students, for instance, treated equitably by postsecondary institutions? Are electronic media used effectively to meet continuing educational needs?

In working toward an integral policy and eventual plan for facilitating lifelong learning in California, the Commission first had to identify the many kinds of specific activities that fit under the general terms, "lifelong learning," "adult education," and "continuing education." The nationwide absence of common definitions has fostered confusion about learning opportunities for adults. In June 1977, the Commission's Committee on Lifelong Learning presented its working definitions of these terms; subsequently, its concepts found their way into reports of national studies.

The Commission's own Five-Year Plan, as well as Assembly Bill 4325 (Vasconcellos, 1976), called for study of such varying programs and institutions as: university extension; concurrent enrollment (in regular courses); certificate and community service programs; adult schools; regular degree programs pursued on a part-time basis; support services (such as counseling and information for part-time enrollees, and help for independent study); and formal education provided by noneducational sponsors (e.g., the military, business, industry, and government).

During 1976, Commission staff completed an initial survey of educational programs offered in California by noneducational sponsors. This exploratory effort found that collecting

> ...definitive data on business, industrial, government and military educational activities which apply exclusively to California would be extremely costly and laborious. However, it does seem feasible to sample various elements of business, industry, government, and military (BIGM) to derive data...useful for statewide planning...(From the Commission document, "Business, Industry, Government, and Military," in the foreword of the October 1976 draft).

Although this study does not distinguish between "training" and "education" for BIGM any more than do studies for universities and colleges, it concludes/finds that

> ...there is more educational activity within the context of BIGM now, and will continue to be in the future, than exists within the confines of institutions of postsecondary education.

In its response to AB 4325, the Commission has gathered data on characteristics of part-time students in the public segments. Data available include age, sex, ethnicity, and educational level. Staff analysis is to be completed in Fall 1978. In addition, the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities has begun to gather data on the types of part-time students served by its member institutions. These data, when combined with those from the public segments, will greatly increase the available information on the nature and extent of adult involvement in postsecondary education.

A Commission staff report, Educational Brokering in California, and a statewide conference on the same subject, both identified a new category of educational services. One kind of broker studied by the Commission is the broker who "serves as an agent of one or more degree-granting institutions for a fee," usually under contract, providing anything from overseas faculty to simple recruitment services. Having explored and clarified certain issues related to brokering--issues such as accrediting policies regarding programs offered directly by brokers, and by brokers in cooperation with an educational institution--the Commission plans no further inquiry into this new service.

In response to a recommendation in its Five-Year Plan and to AB 4325 (1976), the Commission has begun to assess current structures and policies for providing education to adults who are beyond the traditional "college age" range. Staff will compare the various levels of instruction that are available on a non-credit basis. The question of the delineation of function between the K-12 and Community College segments concerning adult education remains a matter of some concern. Proposition 13 touched off abrupt cutbacks in some programs especially intended for adults, such as the Adult School programs, indicating that perhaps the State may be retrenching from its previous policy of fully supporting adult education.

Commission staff has also surveyed the uses of electronic media--primarily television and radio--for instruction beyond the campus and classroom. In California, video is being used, both widely and with sophistication, for instruction in both college-level courses and continuing professional education. The maximum usefulness of this medium for postsecondary education, however, has not yet been attained. The report on electronic media, with recommendations, is scheduled for publication in the winter of 1978.

EDUCATIONAL AND CAREER COUNSELING

The Commission is committed to the establishment and successful operation of community-based advisement centers throughout the State, designed to improve the information, referral, assessment, advisement, and advocacy services available to individuals who want to participate in postsecondary education.

During the past decade, opportunities for postsecondary education and training have expanded significantly for segments of the population previously underrepresented in programs of formal study beyond high school. As a result of new forms of financial aid and new programs for nontraditional students, postsecondary education is now a realistic possibility for countless persons who may have regarded it as beyond their reach.

Experience has shown, however, that merely providing access is not enough to enable students of certain backgrounds and levels of ability to avail themselves of their opportunities. They must be informed of their options and assisted in making appropriate choices from among them.

The Commission, in two separate reports, has itself proposed alternative structures for community advisement centers. In September 1974, the Commission adopted a Plan for a Pilot Educational Advisement Center in Sacramento. In February 1976, the Commission responded to Assembly Concurrent Resolution 159 (Vasconcellos, 1974) in its report entitled Establishing Community Advisement Centers: A Proposal. The Legislature also commissioned a study by the Educational Testing Service of the educational needs of California's adult population. The resulting report, Postsecondary Alternatives: To Meet the Educational Needs of California's Adults was published in September of 1975. The report identified seven groups of adults who did not have adequate educational information services available to them, and ranked them according to need: older adults; ethnic minorities; adults below the poverty level; women over the age of 18; unemployed persons; handicapped persons; and the incarcerated.

The interest of the Legislature in meeting the need for educational information centers was reflected in Assembly Bill 4323, (Vasconcellos), introduced in 1976. The bill proposed a schedule for the creation of up to ten such centers throughout the State within a four-year period. After the bill was defeated in the Assembly fiscal committee, the author introduced similar legislation, Assembly Bill 1672, in 1977. Under the new bill, three pilot educational services centers would have been established by contract with the Postsecondary Education Commission. This bill passed both houses of the Legislature, but was vetoed by the Governor. Each year, however, support for such a proposal has grown.

In April 1978, the Governor signed Assembly Bill 507 (Fazio) into law. As a result of this legislation, the Student Aid Commission will support pilot projects designed to increase the accessibility of postsecondary education opportunities to low-income high school students. Projects must be interinstitutional, and must "increase available information for low-income students on the existence of postsecondary schooling and work opportunities." The legislation appropriated $250,000 for a minimum of five pilot projects.

Earlier this year, the Commission decided that the establishment and operation of these centers should be a priority for community service programs funded under the Title I-A program, which the Commission administers. In September 1978, the Commission approved funding for two pilot community advisement centers--one rural (Monterey) and one urban (Sacramento)--through federal Title I-A funds.

Also earlier this year, the Governor designated the Commission as the responsible agency for the administration of Title IV, Subpart 5 of the Higher Education Act, as amended. Title IV is designed to encourage states to develop Educational Information Centers which will provide information and referral services on all aspects of postsecondary education, including admissions, financial aid, job-training programs, and career options, to name but a few. These services must be made available to all residents in an area or region and, eventually, these Centers must be located throughout the State "within a reasonable distance of all residents," including those in rural areas.

In establishing Educational Information Centers, states may allocate Title IV funds by grant or contract to: (1) institutions of higher education, (2) combinations of such institutions, (3) public and private agencies, or (4) local educational agencies acting in combination with an institution of higher education. States also must identify organizations already providing educational information services and coordinate with them the operation of the Centers.

The federal government has appropriated $2 million for Fiscal Year 1978 for the Title IV program. The California State Plan for Title IV--essentially a process document that describes what kinds of activities would need to take place to prepare for the establishment of Educational Information Centers--was approved by the Commission in July 1978 and forwarded to the U.S. Office of Education. With the recent approval of the State Plan by the U.S. Office of Education, California will receive $45,454 in federal Title IV funds. When matched with the $22,727 in State funds, the first year budget for Title IV will total $68,181. An Amendment to the State Plan for Title IV will be developed for Fiscal Year 1979, which will emphasize implementation of the centers.

BASIC SKILLS DEFICIENCIES

The 1977 Update identified the decline in students' basic skills competencies as a major problem facing postsecondary education. In order to examine proposed and existing solutions to this widely discussed problem, the Commission convened representatives from all levels of education. Early in the project it was decided that the focus should be limited to the decline in basic writing skills, since that seemed to be the most glaring deficiency.

The writing skills project involves two major components, both designed to increase intersegmental communications as to what is being done in this area and to help resolve major statewide problems: (1) the publication of a statewide newsletter, Post Scripts; and (2) the formation and work of the Intersegmental Committee on Writing Skills.

Post Scripts is a statewide, bi-monthly newsletter, published by the Commission as a means of sharing information within the educational community about major problems, innovative programs, legislative activities, and proposed solutions to the decline in student writing skills. The newsletter covers activities in all levels of California education, as well as national legislation and research in the area of writing skills.

The Intersegmental Committee on Writing Skills was established to provide a forum for representatives from every level of education (K-12, the public segments, and the independent institutions) to discuss the writing skills issue and develop joint solutions to the problem. The Committee is considering action on a number of unresolved issues such as: establishment of a single statewide minimum standard of writing proficiency for entrance into Freshman Composition; review of the role of the different segments regarding remedial or basic education; funding and credit for remedial programs; statewide competency examinations vs. affirmative action; the impact of high school proficiency standards on postsecondary education; and successful approaches to in-service teacher training in the area of writing. Activities currently underway include Committee position papers on these issues, and the development of model legislation to deal with the writing skills problem on an intersegmental, cooperative basis.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Vocational education in the State's public secondary schools and community colleges annually receives approximately one-half billion dollars in public funds. Additionally, the State administers well in excess of a billion dollars in CETA funds, of which a large portion is used for vocational training purposes. Since 1976, the Commission has been concerned that the planning and administration of California's vocational education programs are overly influenced by the federal Vocational Education Act; that the governance of these programs is not representative of the diversity of vocational education activity in the State; and that even the coordination of the diverse elements of vocational education at both the State and regional levels is inadequate.

In its 1976 Five-Year Plan the Commission proposed that a staff-level interagency planning council for vocational education be established to bring together public and private secondary and postsecondary education segments in a comprehensive planning effort. Action on this program was deferred when the federal Vocational Education Act was amended to require a similar advisory planning committee at the State level and, concurrently, State legislation, AB 1821 (Montoya, 1975), created Regional Adult and Vocational Education Councils (RAVEC) to carry out a similar function at the regional level.

The Commission advised in its 1977 Update that the State Board of Education and the Legislature should (1) broaden the membership of the advisory planning committee to include private education, and (2) expand the authority of the RAVECs and link their planning efforts to the planning and coordination at the State level.

Neither recommendation has been acted upon. Although the State Board of Education, at the Commission's urging, acknowledged the need for coordinating publicly and privately funded vocational education programs in its 1977 State Vocational Education Plan, no change has occurred in the composition of the State Advisory Planning Committee which would respond to this need.

As a result of the passage of Proposition 13 the statewide initiative to reduce property taxes, the budget for RAVECs was eliminated, making their future highly uncertain and decimating the State's latest effort at regional planning and coordination. In addition, new legislation has been introduced which would repeal the existing legislative mandate for the RAVECs (SB 45, Carpenter, 1978). At the same time, State-level vocational education administrative positions in both the Community College Chancellor's Office and in the Department of Education were eliminated due to passage of Proposition 13. This occurred after both offices had already

experienced severe staff cutbacks by a federal mandate requiring states to provide matching funds in the amount of 40 percent for 1978-79 and 50 percent thereafter for administrative costs.

After four years of concentrated effort to broaden the planning for vocational education, the State has slipped backwards. More money is now being spent on vocational education than ever before--thus, the need for planning and coordination is greater than ever before--but the State is in a poorer position now to cope with this need than it has been for more than a decade.

ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

In the 1977 Update, the Commission focused its attention on the problem of the organization and governance of vocational education. Senate Bill 1028 (Dills, 1977), which would have created a separate State Board of Vocational Education, served as the motivation for considerable dialogue among educators regarding the best form of statewide organization for vocational education.

Although SB 1028 was subsequently dropped, the Commission pursued its own investigation of the problem and concluded that the existing organizational and governance structure of vocational education was not satisfactory because (1) it centered responsibility for vocational education in the State Department of Education while most activities were postsecondary in nature, and (2) it assigned responsibility for governance to one segment while many segments (both educational and employment related) actually carried out the functions of vocational education.

In December 1977, the Commission proposed the establishment of an eleven-member board for vocational education, composed of members of the State Board of Education, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and five public members. Subsequently, legislation was introduced by Assemblyman Collier (AB 2242) to create such a body for planning and coordination purposes, leaving the administrative responsibilities for vocational education programs in the Department of Education and the Chancellor's Office of the Community Colleges. This bill was sent to interim study and is currently inactive.

Concurrent with the discussions of a separate State Board of Vocational Education during 1977-78, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges was negotiating an agreement with the State Board of Education which would delegate more authority for vocational education policy in the Community Colleges to the Board of Governors. The Vocational Education Cooperative Agreement between these two boards, approved by the State Board of Education in June 1978, was not approved by the U.S. Office of Education. Revisions in the Agreement were made by the Board of Governors at their October 1978 meeting and submitted to the Office of Education. These revisions reduced the newly-established Joint Policy Council (through which the Board of Governors was to have exercised some authority for policy development) to an advisory body. The Agreement has been approved by the U.S. Office of Education.

REGULATION OF PRIVATE POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

The State Department of Education currently has the responsibility for the oversight and regulation of private postsecondary educational institutions in order to assure minimum standards of educational quality and student consumer protection. In July 1976, the Commission published a report (The Role of the State in Private Postsecondary Education: Recommendations for Change) which (1) identified several deficiencies in the administration and enforcement of existing laws by the Department of Education; (2) called for a major reform of the regulatory provisions; and (3) identified areas in the Education Code which were inadequate in providing necessary student consumer protection. Based upon the recommendations of this report, a legislative proposal was developed by staff and introduced by Assemblyman Dixon Arnett as Assembly Bill 911. This legislation, cited as the "Private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977," became law on January 1, 1978.

Since July 1976, the State Department of Education has attempted to improve the effectiveness of its regulation of private postsecondary institutions. A tuition insurance program for students attending private postsecondary institutions was enacted into law in 1978 (AB 2790, Hughes). A technical "clean-up" of several provisions of current statute, as revised through AB 911, has also been enacted into law (AB 3744, Waters, 1978). The Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions, in cooperation with the Superintendent of Public Instruction, has established a process for the development and promulgation of administrative rules and regulations. It is expected that new regulations will be adopted by the Superintendent in February 1979.

Before January 1981, the Legislative Budget Committee, in cooperation with the California Postsecondary Education Commission, will evaluate the regulatory provisions concerning private postsecondary institutions, as well as the effectiveness of the Department of Education in administering and enforcing these provisions, and report its findings to the Legislature.

EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Two studies have been undertaken as part of the Commission's broader commitment to educational access for all California residents, in an attempt to evaluate the extent to which recent California high school graduates in all parts of the State have the opportunity to enroll in an institution of higher education and to continue beyond the Community College, when appropriate. The first study involves an analysis of college-going rates for California high school graduates over a four-year period; the second focuses on students who have transferred from Community Colleges to the University of California and the California State University and Colleges.

A report of the analysis of college-going rates was presented to the Commission in September 1978. Rates were calculated for California high school graduates who were first-time freshmen in one of the segments of California higher education and who were 19 years old or under at entrance. Rates were obtained for 1977 for each county, by segment, and for men and women separately. College-going rates were related to eligibility rates for the University and the State University obtained from the Commission's 1976 Eligibility Study. An attempt was made to explain differences in county rates in terms of proximity to institutions and characteristics of the county population. Information was also compiled on the flow of transfer students from Community Colleges to the University and the State University. The findings will be updated annually to determine whether changes are occurring in the participation rates and distribution of students among the segments which might be expected to follow changes in a variety of factors such as the funding of student aid, costs to the student, admission standards, outreach programs, and other policies and programs which should affect access.

The study of Community College transfer students will be completed in 1978-79 and reported to the Commission. Analysis of data for transfers in the State University system is nearing completion. However, there have been continuing problems of locating transfer students in the University's student data files which have slowed progress in the study. Efforts are still under way to identify these students in order to complete the profile of transfer students in the Commission's follow-up study of Community College students which began in 1972. The analysis involves student characteristics and performance both in the Community College and after transfer.

Two new projects have been proposed for the Commission's Activity Plan for the coming year. The first entails the establishment of an Intersegmental Task Force on Admissions and Articulation to deal with current concerns about changes in freshman and transfer

admission requirements, articulation among the postsecondary segments and with the secondary schools, and research related to admissions and student performance.

The second project involves the selection of a sample of California public high schools for rather intensive study over time with respect to both preparation of students for postsecondary education and patterns of subsequent enrollment and persistence. The sample will be selected in such a way that minorities and other disadvantaged students will be overrepresented, in order to obtain more reliable information about the effects of policy and program changes than was possible in the past.

ACCREDITATION

Commission staff, working with the segments, is currently attempting to identify public policy issues connected with the accreditation process that may warrant further study. (See the 1976 Commission report entitled, The Role of the State in Private Postsecondary Education: Recommendations for Change, for a discussion of accreditation in California.)

STATE-LEVEL POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION INFORMATION SYSTEM

COMPUTERIZED DATA BASE

The Commission has continued to build computerized data bases in the areas of student enrollment, degrees conferred, academic and occupational programs, institutional characteristics, and off-campus centers and programs. The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges has submitted enrollment data for fifty-eight of the seventy Community College districts, in a format comparable with that submitted by the University of California and the California State University and Colleges. It is anticipated that all seventy districts will provide enrollment data for 1978. Information about independent institutions continues to be obtained through the Higher Education General Information Survey, administered by the Commission. In addition, staff has met with the Director of the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions to discuss developing common programs for the collection, storage, and retrieval of data on these institutions.

An additional computerized data base has been created, using information obtained from the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's Higher Education Staff Information Survey (EEO-6). The file contains data on ethnicity, sex, job classification, academic rank, and salary for all full-time and part-time employees in the three public segments. More than fifty independent institutions also submitted these data. Information in this file will serve as the base-year data for an analysis of segmental faculty and administrative affirmative action programs to be presented to the Legislature in compliance with Education Code Section 66903 (AB 105, Hughes, 1977).

The computerized data bases also provided the information for revised editions of three documents: Directory of California Colleges and Universities, A Guide to Degree-Granting Institutions in California; Postsecondary Education in California: Information Digest; and Inventory of Academic and Occupational Programs in California Colleges and Universities.

COMMISSION LIBRARY

In 1977, the library received a grant from the federal government for the development of its research collection. As a result, a number of important reference works and periodicals have been added to the collection. The location and delivery of requested material has been considerably improved due to the use of on-line bibliographic searching facilities accessible through the California State Library and participation in various library groups and networks.

During this year, the library has processed 2,189 requests for information, an increase of 20 percent over the previous year, and has distributed 3,145 Commission publications. Questions on higher education in California are now frequently referred from the State Library, the Department of Education and the Governor's Office.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

AB 1091 (Berman, 1978), signed by Governor Brown in September, establishes the authorization for collective bargaining for faculty and staff of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges. The process outlined in the bill would cover all full- and part-time academic and nonacademic employees, who were the only remaining State employees without collective bargaining authorization. (Faculty and staff of the California Community Colleges have had collective bargaining rights since passage of SB 160, Chapter 961, Statutes of 1975.) After the exclusive employee representatives are chosen, the bill requires representatives of the Regents of the University, the Directors of Hastings College of Law, and the Trustees of the State University to negotiate with these representatives, under the aegis of the Public Employment Relations Board. The Board will also oversee similar negotiations with State government and school employees.

The bill limits the "scope of representation" to wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment. Academic matters will not be subject to negotiation, if the legislation is implemented in the spirit of the debate which surrounded its passage. The bargaining units for both segments may be organized either on a campus or systemwide basis and will reflect the traditional pattern of the membership in academic senates. For the University, issues of appointment, promotion and tenure, evaluation, and the processing of grievances will remain the responsibility of the Academic Senate unless the faculty or the administration should decide to make them negotiated issues. For the State University, following an amendment added during the final hours of negotiation on the bill, such issues will also be outside the range of bargaining deliberation; but, for the first time will be "the joint responsibility of the academic senate and the trustees." Under AB 1091, the academic senates continue to operate as decision-making units.

Negotiated settlements will not have to be approved by the Governor or the Legislature unless a change in State law or additional State funding is required for implementation. If the need for such a change occurs as the result of any one item in the settlement, the entire package returns to the bargaining table for revision.

REGIONAL PLANNING

In its original Five-Year Plan (1976), the Commission's recommendation regarding regional planning was to "design a structure for regional planning and make appropriate recommendations on this and other alternatives to the Governor, Legislature, and segments of postsecondary education." The structure was set forth in detail in the Commission report entitled Regional Planning in Postsecondary Education: Objectives, Obstacles, Alternatives (1976).

Two bills were introduced which incorporated the Commission report's recommendations, one by Assemblyman Vasconcellos in 1976, and one by Assemblyman Boatwright in 1977. The Vasconcellos bill was defeated in the Assembly Ways and Means Committee, while the Boatwright bill made it to the Governor's desk but was vetoed.

Regional planning, however, was being tried as a form of governance for vocational education through the Regional Adult and Vocational Education Councils, although with the passage of Proposition 13, the future of these RAVECs is uncertain due to extensive funding cuts. (See the section on Vocational Education for a discussion of the RAVECs.)

STABILIZED, DECLINING, AND SHIFTING ENROLLMENTS

The problem of an impending decline in the overall demand for post-secondary education received attention in the Commission's 1976 Five-Year Plan and in the subsequent 1977 and 1978 Updates. During 1978, the Commission stepped up its efforts to identify the causes and effects of this decline (a decline which in some respects has already begun) and to relate its findings to policy development. The next Five-Year Plan (1980-1984) will be based upon the Commission's analysis of Department of Finance enrollment projections, and assessments of the extent of variation in these projections that could be caused by changes in funding or in educational policies. From the independent sector, information on planned enrollment levels through the next five to seven years will be provided to the Commission by the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, which has been able with the aid of a grant from the Ford Foundation to join in this statewide planning effort.

While concern with the decrease in enrollment is focused primarily on the marked decline expected in the late 1980s, there is evidence that over the next four to five years, the public segments may experience enrollment fluctuations with little net growth. The 1978 Update documented a currently declining growth rate in the two senior public segments and pointed out that this decline was greater than that projected by the Department of Finance. All three public segments showed a decline in actual numbers of enrollments from 1975 to 1976. From 1976 to 1977, both Community College and State University enrollments increased; however, the University enrollment continued to decline slightly at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. During this period (Fall 1976 to Fall 1977), six of the campuses in the senior segments lost enrollments: CSU, Hayward (-502), and the UC campuses at Berkeley (-988), Irvine (-267), Los Angeles (-690), Riverside (-161), and Santa Cruz (-58). In addition, although not falling in enrollments, CSU, Fullerton, and CSU, Sonoma, did experience declines in FTE students. Of the 105 Community Colleges, 27 recorded enrollment declines, which ranged from a loss of 10 students at one campus to 877 students at another. It is important to note, however, that while some campuses are experiencing enrollment declines, others are experiencing enrollment growth. The general trend of declining enrollments is not affecting all institutions equally.

With the end of an era of rapid enrollment growth, during which budgeting was largely linked to enrollment increases, new ways of funding postsecondary education may have to be found. These new approaches will have to be flexible enough to allow for funding specific areas of growth (such as enrollment increases on one or two campuses within a segment), and specific areas of need (such as affirmative action programs or remedial courses), while still recognizing the limits imposed by overall decreased enrollments and demand for postsecondary education.

PROGRAM PLANNING

COMPREHENSIVE SURVEYS OF SELECTED FIELDS OF STUDY

In conjunction with its program review activities, the Commission from time to time recommends that comprehensive, intersegmental surveys of selected fields of study be conducted. In the Commission's first Five-Year Plan, the fields of Teacher Education and the Health Sciences were designated for special review.

As currently planned, the teacher education study will focus on manpower supply and demand in three teacher training programs: teacher aide or assistant programs leading to a certificate or associate degree; traditional baccalaureate credential programs; and graduate and in-service programs. The immediate purpose of the study is to provide a context for the review of new and existing teacher training programs, but it will include a variety of related issues. The study is scheduled for completion in October 1979.

Since the adoption of the report, Health Manpower Study of Selected Health Professions in California, by the Commission in June 1977, staff has completed a draft of the Medical Education section of the California Health Sciences Education Plan. This draft is currently being reviewed by a Technical Advisory Committee and will be transmitted to the Commission and the Legislature as part of the Commission's statewide educational plan for the health professions.

Other selected fields of study--including the performing arts, marine sciences, computer science, social work and community service--have been designated for review as soon as staff resources permit.

COORDINATING HIGHLY SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS

The Commission has recommended that two of the public segments develop plans for the allocation of specialized programs throughout the State. The recommendations call on the State University to prepare a comprehensive policy and plan for the distribution of master's degree programs throughout their system. The State University Chancellor's Office has not yet submitted such a plan.

The Commission has also recommended that the Community College Chancellor's Office prepare a plan for the establishment of highly specialized occupational programs on a regional basis. The Chancellor's Office produced a list of highly specialized programs, but has not yet developed a plan to allocate such programs on a regional basis.

NEW PROGRAM PROPOSALS

For the past three years, Commission staff has identified in advance those programs proposed in the segmental five-year plans which seem to constitute unnecessary duplication. Lists of such programs have been discussed with the members of the Intersegmental Program Review Committee and then published in the Commission's Five-Year Plan and Updates. Although there are a number of reasons why campuses may choose to drop or postpone plans for initiating a proposed program, it appears that the Commission practice of identifying those programs for which there is questionable need is partly responsible for decisions by the University and the State University to drop or table some proposed programs. There is less reason to believe that the publication of lists of questionable programs in the Community Colleges has had the desired impact within that segment, but staff hopes these lists will receive increased attention within that segment in the future.

Commission staff currently is developing a series of recommendations for the review of new and existing programs for 1979-80. After Commission action on these recommendations, they will be distributed to the appropriate segmental offices.

FACILITIES PLANNING

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

In the 1978 Update of the Five-Year Plan, it was noted that the Department of Finance formally requested Commission staff to make a comprehensive study of the boundary lines of the four Community College districts in Orange County. That study, presented to the Commission in March 1978, recommended that the new campus proposed by the Saddleback Community College District be approved and that the location of a second campus of the Rancho Santiago Community College District be disapproved. The study further recommended that the Rancho Santiago and North Orange Community College Districts jointly select a site for a college in the northeastern portion of the county to accommodate the future enrollment growth in both Districts. The Commission approved the recommendation regarding the Saddleback District, but tabled the staff recommendation concerning Rancho Santiago for reconsideration at the May 1978 meeting.

In May, the Commission approved a separate resolution recommending that the Legislature take no action concerning a second campus for the Rancho Santiago Community College District. This resolution was based on an agreement between Commission staff and the District that alternative sites would be considered before a final decision was made on the location of the second campus. At its September 1978 meeting, the Commission agreed to let the district purchase (solely with local funds) 30 acres in the Orange/Canyon area on the condition that no construction would be undertaken with either local or State funds without prior approval by the Commission. Although this purchase of land would provide two potential sites in Northeastern Orange County, the Commission reaffirmed its previous position that only one new campus was needed to serve the educational needs of Northeastern Orange County.

A more extensive study of Community College district boundaries was briefly discussed in the 1978 Update but has not been finalized due to legislative funding restrictions. Once the districting and campus location issues are resolved in Orange County, however, it is possible that a statewide study will be conducted.

In addition to the Commission's consideration of new campuses in Orange County, the issue of the Vocational Training Center of the State Center Community College District in Fresno was reconsidered and the Center approved by the Commission at its March 1978 meeting. The Commission had indicated several objections to the Center in February 1977, including the fact that it had no adequate facilities and little financial aid for its students. Staff had also noted that there were substantial conflicts between the Center and the adult and

regional occupational programs in the same area. In the intervening thirteen months between the Commission's two considerations of this project, the questions were resolved satisfactorily and the project was formally approved for State funding.

OFF-CAMPUS OPERATIONS AND EXTENDED DEGREE PROGRAMS

For several years, the Commission has been interested in the growth of off-campus operations and extended degree programs. The staff's annual Survey of Off-Campus Instruction has monitored this growth for the past two years and this year the Legislature has requested an extensive study of these activities, one which would include not only an inventory of programs and services offered, but also a detailed analysis and recommendations concerning future developments of both off-campus operations and extended degree programs.

To support this study, the Legislature appropriated $33,771 for fiscal 1978-79 and 1979-80, an amount which will partially defray the costs of the contemplated eighteen-month effort. The first phase of the study will include an historical background of extended and off-campus operations and a description of existing off-campus operations by segment. This description will include courses and programs offered, demographic characteristics of students, locations of programs, types of facilities, support services, funding sources and expenditures, staffing, outputs, degrees and certificates, and organizational arrangements such as consortia, colleges without walls, store fronts, permanent centers, and cooperative endeavors. Phase I of the study will be confined to the four-year segments and will include an analysis of access, program and facility choice, duplication and competition, funding, fees, alternative support models, and the current Commission and segmental approval processes for programs and facilities.

In Phase II, to be completed by January 1980, the information from the interim report will be updated and an analysis performed of off-campus instruction in the California Community Colleges. Special attention will be given to access, program and facilities choice and the rest of the items which will have been analyzed for the four-year segments. In addition, consideration will also be given to comparative costs and funding mechanisms in all segments, quality control and accreditation, comparisons with other states, analysis of other educational vendors (such as out-of-state vendors offering courses in California), correspondence courses, industrial courses, military courses, and educational brokers.

NEW OFF-CAMPUS OPERATIONS AND EXTENDED DEGREE PROGRAMS

The passage of Proposition 13 has created an atmosphere of fiscal austerity in California that has caused many decision makers to scrutinize more carefully proposals for new programs and facilities. In general, it appears that some needed expenditures may not be made unless it can be demonstrated that they are not just desirable, but absolutely essential. The Commission will continue to review all proposals for new programs and facilities, taking into consideration both the benefits and the costs of such off-campus operations and programs.

Cross-Reference Table

	Issue	Origins/Discussions
1.	Equal Educational Opportunity: Access and Retention	1976 Plan (pp. 41-42) 1977 Update (pp. 29-46) 1978 Update (pp. 24-36)
2.	Faculty and Administrative Affirmative Action	1978 Update (pp. 14-18)
3.	Financing Postsecondary Education	1976 Plan (pp. 33-36) 1977 Update (pp. 85-88) 1978 Update (pp. 39-44)
4.	Student Financial Aid	1976 Plan (pp. 49-50) 1977 Update (p. 25) 1978 Update (pp. 45-46)
5.	Tuition, Fees, and Access	1977 Update (pp. 61-70) 1978 Update (pp. 47-48)
6.	Adult Education/Lifelong Learning	1976 Plan (pp. 29-32) 1977 Update (pp. 47-59) 1978 Update (pp. 49-54)
7.	Educational and Career Counseling	1976 Plan (p. 45) 1977 Update (p. 25) 1978 Update (pp. 55-56)
8.	Basic Skills Deficiencies	1977 Update (pp. 71-74) 1978 Update (pp. 64-65)
9.	Vocational Education	1976 Plan (pp. 47-48) 1977 Update (p. 25) 1978 Update (pp. 57-58)
10.	Organization and Governance of Vocational Education	1978 Update (pp. 11-14)
11.	Regulation of Private Vocational Institutions	1976 Plan (pp. 37-38) 1977 Update (pp. 23-24) 1978 Update (pp. 59-60)

	Issue	Origins/Discussions
12.	Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Postsecondary Education	1976 Plan (p. 43) 1977 Update (p. 24) 1978 Update (pp. 61-62)
13.	Accreditation	1977 Update (pp. 89-94) 1978 Update (p. 63)
14.	State-Level Postsecondary Education Information System	1976 Plan (pp. 21-28) 1977 Update (pp. 21-22) 1978 Update (pp. 37-38)
15.	Collective Bargaining	1976 Plan (p. 51) 1977 Update (pp. 25-26) 1978 Update (p. 68)
16.	Regional Planning	1976 Plan (p. 39) 1977 Update (p. 24) 1978 Update (pp. 66-67)
17.	Stabilized, Declining, and Shifting Enrollments	1977 Update (pp. 75-83) 1978 Update (pp. 69-71)
18.	Program Planning	1976 Plan (pp. 59-64) 1977 Update (pp. 96-107) 1978 Update (pp. 73-74)
19.	Facilities Planning	1976 Plan (pp. 64-65) 1977 Update (pp. 107-121) 1978 Update (pp. 75-76)